



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## IS JAPAN DISMANTLING CHINA?

**T**HERE is evidence that the prevailing American impression as to the nature of Japan's recent transactions with China is a bit wide of the mark. It is generally assumed, we believe, that Japan has committed an act of high-handed aggression against her ancient but helpless neighbor. But the documents of the transaction as now published reveal evidences both of moderation and of a regard for China's own welfare that have not always been shown even by the Christian powers in their dealings with China.

The convention consists of two treaties and the exchange of thirteen notes. In addition, in pursuance with Japan's advice, the President of China has declared inalienable the entire Chinese coast, a declaration which applies to all foreign powers, including Japan.

Of the two treaties the first pertains to the province of Shantung, in which Kiao-chow is located, and which was Germany's "sphere of influence" until dislodged by Japan last autumn. The treaty provides for the transfer to Japan of the rights held by Germany in case of an ultimately favorable issue of the present war, but with this important exception, that Kiao-chow is to be restored to China. There is also provision that both Kiao-chow and other cities and towns shall be thrown open to foreign residence and trade,—a wider opening, not a closing, of the "open door." Moreover, in an attached note China declares the inalienability of any part of the territory of Shantung or of any island along its coast, this being a special safeguard to Japan, since Shantung lies right across from Korea.

The other treaty pertains to south Manchuria and eastern inner Mongolia. This region, too, was not originally Japan's sphere of influence, but Russia's, and was taken over at the close of the Russo-Japanese War. South Manchuria is about one-fourth of all Manchuria, the rest being still held by Russia. The boundaries of eastern inner Mongolia are still only vaguely defined, but the territory involved is less than half of that still under Russian influence. The whole is a sparsely-populated region. The treaty extends the term of the leases of the Port Arthur-Dalney territory and of the South Manchuria and Antung-Mukden railways to ninety-nine years, the same length as that of the other existing leases to foreign powers along the China coast. It also grants Japanese subjects the right to lease land in South Manchuria, to travel, reside, and do business in the same region and to engage in joint agricultural enterprises with the Chinese in certain towns in eastern inner Mongolia. Certain towns are also to be thrown open to foreign residence and trade in this region, and finally in the whole region covered by this treaty Japanese subjects shall obey Chinese law and pay Chinese taxes, but in case of violations of law are to

be tried by the Japanese consular courts until such time as the judicial system of China shall have been perfected. Then all offenders shall be tried by the regular Chinese courts. Notes attached to the treaty grant considerable mining concessions and also give Japan the preference when railway loans are to be raised or foreign advisers employed.

The whole agreement concerning this region is far more respectful of China's authority and upholds the principle of the open door far more definitely than was the case in the agreement with Russia before. Russia, it will be remembered, had gone so far as to set a viceroy over Manchuria previous to the Russo-Japanese War.

A separate note provides for the safeguarding of the vested interests of Japanese capitalists in the Hanyeh-ping Iron Company, and still another closes the door against the establishment by a foreign power of a naval base along the coast of Fukien province directly opposite Formosa.

There is no doubt that Japan will derive considerable gain in material resources and in prestige through the consummation of these treaties. Especially in Manchuria and Mongolia will she have an outlet for her surplus population and be in a position to derive profit from a share in the material development of the country. But while her geographical, racial, and linguistic proximity to China might justly entitle her to a larger share of concessions than other powers, as a matter of fact even under the new treaties it is clear that she has much less. Her acquisitions are scarcely to be compared with Russia's vast domain in north Manchuria and outer Mongolia; or with Great Britain's "sphere of influence" in the great Yangtse Kiang valley running through the heart of China and her rights in Tibet; or with France's great sphere in the Mekong valley and her sovereignty over Annam; or with Germany's former hold on Shantung; or with America's Standard Oil Company's sixty years' monopoly on the oil of Chihli and Shensi provinces, a monopoly which gives China only five per cent of the crude oil. And all of these "spheres" include rich mining, railway, and other concessions.

Furthermore, the advantage in the new treaties is not all on Japan's side. China, too, is benefited. In the first place the great strategic port of Kiao-chow is to be returned to China at the close of the war. In the second place China's integrity is more secure than it was before. Japan has obligated herself to stand by China in resistance against the further alienation of her coast through conquest, purchase or lease of any port, harbor or island. In the third place Japan gives the first promise to surrender her extraterritoriality privileges in China, thus removing from her sovereignty this vexatious infringement which all the powers have considered unavoidable hitherto. It is possible to conceive that these very steps

taken by Japan may be the means of turning the scale in favor of the permanent integrity and independence of China.

However, in addition to what was finally embodied in the treaties there are certain demands which Japan originally made but later dropped or left for future negotiation. These must also be considered, for they have been taken to reveal especially Japan's ultimate purposes. These "Group Five" demands have given special concern. They pertain to the employment of Japanese advisers, the right to purchase land for hospitals, temples and schools, joint police in certain places where many Japanese reside, the purchase of a certain quantity of munitions of war from Japan, certain preferential treatment in Fukien province, and the right to preach. But even in these propositions there is nothing to prove conclusively that Japan had in view anything other than she professed, namely, the permanent peace of the Far East. Japan has waged two wars to check movements that she regarded as threatening her own national existence. It is natural that she does not want to repeat the costly experience. But the scramble of the Western powers for "rights" in China has been such that not only the virtual dismemberment of China, but the domination of all Asia by these powers is more than a remote possibility. While some of the "Group Five" propositions seemed to aim merely at placing Japan on a par with other powers in certain respects, others probably had the deeper significance of an endeavor to stem a tide that certainly is on and affects both China's and Japan's most vital interests.

But why has China's protest against Japan's action been so bitter? One reason no doubt is that China is nationally more awake than ever before. Then there are rumors of sinister influences behind the scenes at Peking inciting the government to resist Japan's demands. Further, there is a strong feeling of antipathy against the Japanese people on the part of certain Chinese. Hence it is, no doubt, that Japan felt justified in using a kind of coercion to secure acquiescence to an agreement deemed by her to be moderate and patently to the advantage of China. But it is not the first time that China has been coerced. Even as late as 1913, when China hesitated to agree to what England wanted in Tibet, Sir Edward Grey hinted at dire consequences in case of refusal and China gave in.

These seem to be the facts dispassionately stated. It appears plainly, therefore, that the attitude of the United States in the Far East should simply be to extend to Japan and China nothing but appreciation, respect, and continued friendship. In no group of nations is it more apparent than in that of the United States, China, and Japan, that the interests of all are the interests of each, and that the interests of each are the interests of all.

## OUR BASIS OF CONSISTENCY

IF THE fear of inconsistency be the bane of petty minds, it is also true that consistency is a jewel of no little merit. We court adverse criticism because it is that kind of criticism that keeps us awake. We are thoroughly convinced that we are not trying to make white appear black, neither are we trying to make black appear white; but when the same mail brings one request for a canceled subscription because we are "too pro-German," and another because we are "evidently anti-German," we are led to a searching of heart.

We have been called "militarists" because we published an article from ex-Congressman Bartholdt, a portion of which "advocated the prohibition of the exportation of arms from this country." The same writer again calls us "militarists" because we associate ourselves with Mr. Bartholdt, who happens to be one of our Executive Committee, and because we gave currency to his "argument for giving aid and comfort to the Hohenzollern military machine." The same friendly individual thinks the peace societies are not facing the issue; that they are "shirking actual conditions and mumbling theories." We have been censured for not shaking our fists in the face of Germany and for refusing to print certain "programs" which have appeared from time to time. Indeed, it is openly charged that "the peace societies are being financed by the Germans." And so it goes.

We do not profess to be able to put out the international conflagration now devastating the world. The fact is we are not a fire company. We are trying to market international asbestos. We are neutral in the sense that we are against all war, and therefore against the nations now at war, so far as they are at war. We have our opinions in the varying issues, but we do not parade them all because they are not all relevant to the real problem we have set before us. Every nation at war honestly considers itself in the right, fighting for self-defense, promoting the highest good. None desires war. And yet war is. It exists; a hideous fact.

Furthermore, we do not feel warranted in attacking any one nation as wholly to blame in the premises, for each has had its faults, its fuel ready for the burning. It is not our business to emphasize those things which embitter and separate nations. We do not propose to emphasize them.

In the midst of the Franco-Prussian war, in August, 1870, this society took the ground that as friends of peace we had nothing whatever to do with the question which of the two great powers were to blame. Our position was then and now is that we aim to show the utter uselessness and criminality of the entire war system, which should be banished from the earth. During our Civil War this society, its officers all loyal to the North, stated over and over that its aim was not to interfere